

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this Application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0233507 to Yu et al. ("Yu"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 describes a card access apparatus that is adapted to be connected to a plurality of types of cards. Importantly, amended claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes "a single slot adapted to accommodate the plurality of types of cards." Thus, the apparatus is able to access several types of cards using a single read slot. As described in the specification, one advantage of the apparatus is that it enables the use of multiple types of cards in a single slot without encountering a failure such as a short circuit. See, for example, Application at p. 5, ll. 4-10.

Yu fails to disclose "the apparatus comprising: a single slot adapted to accommodate [a] plurality of types of cards." Yu does not have a combo connector capable of accommodating and handling various types of cards via a single slot. Yu discloses an electronic card that can handle various types of interfaces such as a CF interface and a USB interface, but the disclosed electronic card does not relate to a combo connector having a single slot that can accommodate the various types of cards as can be observed in paragraphs [0016]-[0017] and Figure 1 in Yu. Indeed, Yu only discloses multiple interface ports (11, 14), which are physically separated from each other, corresponding to different types of interfaces rather than a single port that can accommodate the various interfaces.

For at least these reasons, Yu does not teach or suggest all features of amended claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 4-5, 8, and 9-12 depend from claim 1 or include similar limitations as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yu in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0046877 to Hirari et al. ("Hirari").

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all limitations of claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over Yu, and Hirari does not add anything to cure the deficiencies of Yu with respect to claim 1. Hirari describes a CF card casing with a slot that accepts only CF cards, and therefore does not teach or suggest "a single slot adapted to accommodate [a] plurality of types of cards." Hirari Abstract; Figure 1. Claims 6 and 7 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any additional charges in connection with this filing or any subsequent filings (including but not limited to issue fees), the Examiner is respectfully requested and authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1073 therefor under Order No. R2184.0473/P473.

Dated: December 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Mark J. Thronson  
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082  
Jonathan L. Falkler  
Registration No.: 62,115  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1825 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-5403  
(202) 420-2200  
Attorneys for Applicant